

**Remarks**

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Office Action mailed April 3, 2008 ("*Office Action*"). Claims 1-8, 11-18, and 21-24 are pending in the Application and stand rejected. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

The *Office Action* rejects Claims 1-8, 11-18, and 21-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,008,785 issued to Hewlett et al. ("*Hewlett*"), which is a patent granted to the inventor of the present Application. In order to advance prosecution Applicant has amended Claims 1, 11, and 21. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and submits that *Hewlett* does not describe, expressly or inherently, each and every limitation of the claims for at least the reasons provided below.

As amended, Claim 1 recites "operating a display to create a linearity error in at least one image bit via a sequence of bit display periods." Claim 1 further recites that "at least two compensating bit periods of the at least one image bit hav[e] a bit period such that the linearity error created by said skewing occurs during said compensating bits periods and remains within the image bit." *Hewlett* does not disclose operating a display to create a linearity error in at least one image bit.

In rejecting a previous version of Claim 1, the Office Action points to FIGURES 9A and 9B of *Hewlett* and contends that "when the resets are skewed to correct for overlap, the weights are changed from a target weight." *Office Action*, page 3. In response to Applicant's previous arguments the Office Action further contends that "Hewlett discloses that as a result of the skewing segments n and n+2 have increased display times for some of their groups (col. 9, line 66-col. 10, line 1), which is to say their weights have been changed from the actual weight." *Office Action*, page 10. However, nowhere does *Hewlett* disclose operating a display to create a linearity error in at least one image bit. This can be seen in *Hewlett* where it states "if [segments n and n+2] are not segments of the same bit-plane, a 'counterskew' must be placed somewhere else in the frame." *Hewlett*, column 10, lines 3-5. The counterskew is to counteract the reset skew disclosed by *Hewlett* and relied on by the Office Action. Thus, because *Hewlett* discloses that the "'counterskew' must be placed

somewhere else in the frame" it is clear *Hewlett* wants to ensure that there are no linearity errors. *Hewlett*, column 10, lines 3-5 (emphasis added).

The portion of *Hewlett* identified by the Office Action does not show a complete image bit, but rather a select number of bit periods of an image bit. *Hewlett*, FIGURES 9A and 9B. As is known by one skilled in the art, an image bit consists of multiple bit periods. The Office Action has identified in *Hewlett* a change in a bit period. However, because *Hewlett* requires the use of a "counterskew" the image bit of *Hewlett*, which comprises additional bit periods besides the bit periods depicted in FIGURES 9A and 9B, does not contain a linearity error.

Therefore, for at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, and all claims depending therefrom, are allowable over *Hewlett*. For at least certain analogous reasons Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 11 and 21, and all claims depending therefrom, are allowable over *Hewlett*.


**CONCLUSION**

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place the Application in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference or an interview would advance prosecution of the Application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicant stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge \$810.00 for this RCE and \$120.00 for a one month extension of time to Deposit Account No. 20-0668 of Texas Instruments Incorporated. Applicant believes no other fees are due; however, should there be a fee discrepancy, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 20-0668 of Texas Instruments Incorporated.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
Attorneys for Applicant



Bradley P. Williams  
Reg. No. 40,227  
(214) 953-6447

Date: August 4, 2008

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

Customer Number: **23494**